

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
Application No.: 09/829,676
Attorney Docket No.: A8693

REMARKS

New claims 25-27 are added, hence, claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are amended.

The new claims are supported at least at page 21, lines 13-19 of the specification.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the final Office Action dated March 23, 2006, claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mills. Applicant amends claim 1 and traverses the rejection.

With regard to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, the Examiner states in the final Office Action that the video editing system taught in Mills performs the same function as of the instant application, and cites to Fig. 2, col. 4, line 47 - col. 5, line 25 and col. 4, lines 29-46. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for specifying a selection of content segments. The method includes receiving specification of a plurality of portions of first content stored in a first format, in which the specification identifies beginning and ending frames for each portion. The method further includes building a list comprising a starting mark and ending mark for each selected portion of first content. The list is used for accessing corresponding portions of the same content stored as second content in a second format. Claim 1 specifies that “the first content is stored in a first storage medium and the second content is stored in a second storage

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114
Application No.: 09/829,676
Attorney Docket No.: A8693

medium wherein the second storage medium is a slower access storage medium than the first storage medium.”

Mills relates to an editing apparatus that digitizes selected video segments into multiple digitized clips. In Mills, a clip edit window 22 shown in Fig. 2 simultaneously displays such multiple digitized clips, each of which includes a begin frame 40 and an end frame 42. In the final Office Action it is asserted that video window 20, shown in Fig. 2 of Mills, corresponds to the claimed first content stored in a first format, and that the video clip in the clip edit window 38 corresponds to the claimed second content stored in a second format.

However, Mills neither teaches nor suggests that the video in video window 20 is stored in a different storage medium than the video clip playing in edit window 38, much less discussing the speed of any such storage media. Further, Mills does not teach or suggest that either the video frame 36 or the begin and end frames 40 and 42 are used to access the video clip playing in edit window 38. Accordingly, since Mills does not teach or suggest any of these claimed features, Mills does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

II. Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 3-7, 11-15 and 19-23

Claims 3-7, 11-15 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Fujita.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114

Application No.: 09/829,676

Attorney Docket No.: A8693

Applicants submit that claims 3-7 are patentable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because Fujita fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills discussed above.

Claims 11-15 and 19-23 are patentable at least because they contain features similar to those discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, and because Fujita fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills.

B. Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24

Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills. In making the rejection, the Examiner has taken official notice that it is well known in the art to embody inventions in software to be executed by a computer.

Claims 9-10, 16-18 and 24 are patentable at least because they contain features analogous to these discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection of claim 1, and because the official notice fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mills.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.


The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114

Application No.: 09/829,676

Attorney Docket No.: A8693

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Warren Lytle, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

J. Warren Lytle, Jr.

Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 24, 2006